

CS. TÖTTÖSSY

THE SYSTEM OF THE ADIECTIVUM VERBALE IN THE LATIN LANGUAGE

I. The origin of the formative suffix of the gerundive and the gerund has not yet been clarified completely and it has not yet been decided reassuringly either, whether the gerundive or the gerund came into existence first. It is doubtless that this form of the adjective formed from verbs by suffix *-ndo-* belongs to the Italic languages, but we do not propose to deal with all this now. The purpose of these lines is only to point out that the Latin participle which is called and can be called both gerundive and participle, should by no means be called an instant form any longer — either in the secondary school and University education, or in our Latin grammars and text-books of different grades —, although this is quite general in Hungary and is usual also elsewhere. We should not call the gerundive instant, because in classical Latin it is not instant!

The various large Latin grammars or historical grammars, if they use the designation participle for the gerundive, put various attributes beside the participle (passive). As the participles have no tempus (only actio), therefore the attributes present and future, since thus they are incorrect, should be avoided in advance, in our opinion. Thus the only correct denomination of the gerundive is *participium imperfectum passivi*.

The imperfect character of the gerundive is evident, but — thinking just about the viewpoints of education (and opposed to the so far entirely general practice) — we should like to elucidate the participle imperfect character of the gerundive on the pages of this journal as follows:

1. The gerundive is formed from the imperfect root. The imperfect root in Latin, like in the Indo-European languages in general, is as a rule a secondary variant of the verbal root. [The imperfect root can be formed also in Latin by reduplication (*sisto*), by a nasal element (*lino*), by the semi-vowel *i* (*cipio*), by the formative suffix *sc* (*cresco*), etc., although the imperfect root can also remain identical with the verbal root.] Naturally, all forms of the imperfecta actio are formed from the imperfect root, and it is also natural that each of the forms brought about from the imperfect root is imperfect. Thus the gerundive cannot be held anything else either than imperfect, just like the gerund. (At school the explana-

tion that the passive participle «instant» is formed from the imperfect root, is not clear. Teaching of Latin at school can definitely be made more successful also by the avoiding of such, erroneous explanations, similar to which could still be mentioned.)

2. The gerund is undoubtedly an imperfect form. In fact — as it is also taught — it is used for the substitution of the oblique cases of the infinitivus imperfectus. The gerundival construction on the other hand, is an equivalent of identical meaning and identical value to the gerundial construction. Thus it is obvious that the gerundive cannot have other actio than the gerund or the infinitive imperfect. (The difference between the gerundive and the gerund appears only in the kinds of verbs, viz. in the fact that the gerundive is passive, while the gerund is active, and also in the circumstance that the gerundive is an adjectival form and not a substantival form, however their actio is identical.)

3. It is clear that in the so called gerundival constructions the gerundive has no instant meaning. How could one assert that in such sentences as the ... *loquendi elegantia* ... *augetur legendis oratoribus et poetis* (Cic. De or. 3, 39) or *A rebus gerendis senectus abstrahit* (Cic. Cato 15) and in the others the gerundive would be of instant character, that is subsequent?

4. According to the Latin conception, the gerundive has no instant sense in the case of those gerundival constructions either, where the gerundival construction is used as an adverbial modifier of purpose (thus in the case of *ad* + acc. or gen. + *causa* or *gratia* either). Here we should think of the fact that if instead of the gerundival (or gerundial) constructions we use clauses of purpose [introduced by the conjunction *ut* (or by a relative pronoun)], then also in this case in the clause of purpose the verbum finitum will always be put in imperfecta actio (and not in instant)! [We should also consider that the meaning of the word *imperfectum* does not mean also otherwise «continuous» («being already in progress»), but only «unfinished», «not yet finished»!] Examining the other forms of expression of the adverbial modifier of purpose, we see that the use of the imperfecta actio is general. Thus participle imperfect is used (as participium coniunctum) (first of all beside *venio*), e.g.: *Romam legatos missos a Campanis in quibusdam annalibus invenio postulantes* ... (Liv. 23, 6, 6) and infinitive imperfect (especially by poets) e.g.: *Non nos... Libycos populare penates venimus* ... (Verg. Aen. 1, 527). About the supinal expression of the adverbial modifier of purpose (similarly after the verbs meaning motion or causing of motion) we can note that the supine is really no imperfect form, because it is not formed from the imperfect root but from the verbal root, but, on the other hand, it is no instant either. The adverbial modifier of purpose can have only one expression with an instant from [similarly with participium coniunctum, but as a matter of fact from the viewpoint of the Latin language (just like the above participle imperfect) is no adverbial modifier of purpose, but an adverbial modifier of state]: when the active participle instant is used, e.g.: *Iipse... Genuam repetit* ... *Italiam defensurus* (Liv. 21, 32, 5). However, we

should not forget about the fact that this only instant way of expression is used more or less only since Livy.

5. Now we do not want to enter into a detailed explanation of the circumstance that the gerundive developed first in the case of the (intransitive) deponent verbs (e.g. *oriundus*), then in the case of other intransitive verbs (e.g. *senescendus*), and only thereafter also in the case of the transitive verbs, and naturally its passive meaning could develop only at this time. Now the important point for us is to point out that in these oldest gerundives there is no instant sense, but these had a fully imperfect sense. In the above or in the word *secundus*, which originally had the meaning «following», «subsequent» and therefore later on the meaning (that following the first one, that is) the «second», where could we find the instant sense?

6. The gerundive can never be used as instant, when in fact an instant form would be needed in the passive. Then, when (e.g. in an indirect question or after *quoniam*) in the case of active predicate there is instant in the subordinate clause, e.g.: ... *antea dubitabam, venturaene essent* (sc. legiones), *nunc mihi non est dubium, quoniam ... venturae non sint* (Cic. Fam. 2, 17, 5), we cannot use gerundive in passive as its equivalent (as the gerundive is not at all instant), but instead of instant (because this does not exist in passive), only a periphrase with an active expression (although not frequently used in good Latin) is possible (that is *futurum* + the imperfect conjunctive of *sum* + *ut* + the conjunctive passive imperfect of the verb), that is a form like: *Non dubito, quoniam futurum sit, ut hoc carmen discatur*.

7. In the same way and for the same reasons the gerundive + *esse* cannot be used in classical Latin as passive infinitive instant either in the accusative cum infinitive or in the case of the passive form of the verbs without supine, when the only passive instant form, viz. the infinitive formed by supine + *iri*, cannot be formed. We can use only the periphrase formed by *fore* (or *futurum esse*) + *ut* + passive imperfect conjunctive, like one of these forms: *Scio futurum esse, ut hoc carmen discatur*, which is frequently used also in the case of the existence of the supine stem, e.g.: ... *sperant fore, ut ... filius ab illo furore revocetur* (Cic. Verr. 2, 97).

8. In fact, in classical Latin the passive infinitive instant cannot be formed by gerundive + *esse* either, but only by supine + *iri*, as, on the one hand, the gerundive is not instant, and on the other hand, because the gerundive beside the *esse* contains also the sense of *necessitas* (necessity).

9. In the eight remarks given above we spoke about the use of the gerundive in which there is no sense of *necessitas*. If, however, we see the gerundive expressing necessity, it is clear also there that the equivalent of the sentence *Puer mihi laudandus est* is *Puerum laudare debeo*. But, in fact, this *debeo* is also undoubtedly an imperfect. It is true that in such cases I do not praise the boy, but I only must praise him. It is, however, doubtless that necessity of praising exists now, that is the *laudandus est* is also a present imperfect form. Or is it not quite clear that in the senten-

ce... *ante tribunal regis destitutus* (sc. Mucius, who at that time is not yet Scaevola), *tum quoque inter tantas fortunae minas metuendus magis quam metuens «Romanus sum» inquit «civis; C. Mucium vocant; hostis hostem occidere volui»*... (Liv. 2, 12, 8) the participia coniuncta *metuendus* and *metuens* with the function of attributa praedicativa (adverbial modifiers of state) have exactly identical actio, viz. imperfective?

II. This means, of course that in our opinion the system of the coniugatio periphrastica is not that either, what it used to be presented to be. In fact, according to the aboves the *laudandus est* is obviously present imperfect, and thus the coniugatio periphrastica does not consist of the active of the instans actio (*laudaturus sum*) and the passive of the instans actio (as the *laudandus sum* is not instant), but 1) of the verb *sum* and the passive participle imperfect (*laudandus sum*), but this also contains the additional meaning of necessity, 2) of the verb *sum* and the passive participle perfect (*laudatus sum*), which we use as the perfect passive of the verb, and 3) of the verb *sum* and the active participle instant (*laudaturus sum*), which is the only instant form within the coniugatio periphrastica (although, as a matter of fact, the *laudatum iri* is also a periphrased and instant form). — Beside the form *laudans* the *est* is rarely used.

III. After these the clear distinction of the two kinds of the gerundive is also important, viz.:

1. The passive participle imperfect form *without* necessitas, which formally is always *only an attribute*. This occurs:

a) As a real attribute, in the case of early participles defining nouns more closely, e.g.: *oriundus*, *senescendus*, *placendus*, etc.

b) Formally as attribute in such constructions, which are similar to the nouns with attributes *in medio foro*, *in summo monte*. As a matter of fact, in these not the noun is more closely defined by the attribute, but — if I am permitted to say — the attribute is defined by the noun. (This is the case, when instead of the Latin construction with attributive adjective we translate into other languages with the construction containing possessive attribute, but so that in other languages the possessive attribute will be made from the Latin qualified word.) Thus — as it is generally known — their meanings are not «in the middle forum» or «on the biggest mountain» (as the formal translation of the noun with attribute *in foro medio* would be), but «in the middle of the forum» and «on the summit of the mountain».

α) The major part of the gerundival constructions under point b) are such, the equivalents of which could also be gerundial constructions with the *same* case or praeposition. The gerundive of this character is formed only from transitive verbs, as well as from the verbs *utor*, *fruor*, *fungor*, *potior* and *vescor*. In this case only the prepositional accusative and the other oblique cases of the gerundive are used. Thus it is very misleading to translate these gerundival constructions with the attributive adjective construction having the sense of necessitas, on the one

hand, because in these gerundives there is no sense of *necessitas*, and on the other hand, because just as the translation «the middle forum» instead of «the middle of the forum» would be wrong, similarly different is the sense and the interpretation of the character of e.g. *miranda facta* (Plaut. Rud. 344), that is «admirable deeds (or deeds worth admiration)», of and, on other hand, of e.g.: ... *felix vobis corrumpendis fuit* (Liv. 3, 17, 2), that is «he was successful in leading you astray». Thus under this item gerundival constructions of the latter sense are to be discussed, which are equivalents (with difference in the actio) to such participial constructions like *post conditam urbem* (Cic. Phil. 5, 17), *post civitatem a L. Bruto liberatam* (ibidem) or ... *barbarus eum* (sc. Hasdrubalem) *quidam* ... *ob iram interfecti ab eo domini obtruncavit* (Liv. 21, 2, 6), similarly to which these gerundival constructions can also occur in cases without prepositions (however only in genitive, in dative and in ablative), as well as in prepositional cases. [Otherwise, on the occasion of the explanation of these gerundival construction at the schools, instead of the wrong explanation with the adjectival form having of sense necessity (and also in place of the starting out from the transformation of the gerundial construction into gerundival construction) we would believe it more correct to simply point out that just as in the given case the *in medio foro* does not mean «in the middle forum» and the *post conditam urbem* does not mean «after the founded city», and that the *ob iram interfecti domini* also means «in his outburst of passion because of the killing of his lord», in the same way this *legendis poetis* also means «by reading the poets» (and in the given case not at all «by the poets to be read»). If, however, one still would like to give the gerundive some adjectival meaning, this could be at the most «coming to be read» and not «ought to be read».]

β) The other kind of the gerundival construction in item b), the gerundive beside *curo* which, of course, is used only in accusative and without preposition, and it is also formed only from transitive verbs and in the case of *utor* and the other verbs of its group [see item α]. This, however, has no gerundial equivalent. E.g.: *Hunc* (sc. perfugam) *Fabricius reducendum curavit ad Pyrrhum* (Cic. Off. 3, 86).

2. Passive imperfect participle having the sense *necessitas*. This can stand:

a) Depending from verbs, with predicative sense:

α) After the active forms of certain verbs (*do*, *trado*, *mitto*, etc.) the accusative of the gerundive beside a substantival accusative, and the nominative of the gerundive beside a substantival nominative is used with predicative sense (in reality not as an adverbial modifier of purpose from the viewpoint of the Latin language, but as an adverbial modifier of state). [This is also formed only from transitive verbs and in the case of *utor* and the other verbs of its group (see above).] E.g.: ... *domos nostras et patriam ipsam* ... *diripiendam* ... *reliquimus* (Cic. Fam. 16, 12, 1) or ... *quae* (sc. Sicilia) *mihi defendenda tradita est* (Cic. Verr. 5, 188). (This has also to be

translated already (verbally) as «which was delivered to me as to be defended.») Instead of these constructions beside the substantival accusative (or nominative) *ad* + gerund can also stand, in place of the predicative gerundive, e.g.: *quos sibi ipsi deligerint ad imitandum* (Cic. Off. 2, 46). (Thus the gerundial equivalent of this is quite different from the case in item 1) α), viz. in place of the gerundival form without preposition the gerund expressed with *ad* + accusative is used and not a gerund of identical case and preposition.

β) Beside the forms of the *sum* (relating to the substantival nominative) only the nominative of the gerundive is used, and its accusative also occurs only in the accusativo cum infinitivo (relating to substantival accusative). This gerundive used beside the forms of *sum* — in the case of impersonal construction — can occur also in connection with intransitive verbs. (In this case the *utor* and the other verbs of its group mentioned above can also occur only with impersonal construction.) Thus at this time the verb of the gerundive can preserve its verbal government, if that is not accusative. (Naturally, this gerundive can always be translated by means of predicate having sense of necessitas. This is that mentioned *puer laudandus est* form.)

b) This gerundive having the sense of necessitas is also used as attribute, and naturally, at this time any case of it can occur, and it is formed most frequently from the verbs expressing sentiment, e.g. the case of *miranda facta* mentioned above. (However, it occurs more frequently rather in the later poets and prose writers.) This form of the gerundive, as the adjective in general, can be used not only as attribute but also as attributum praedicativum, just like the *metuendus* in the passage of Livy mentioned above, or sometimes also as a substantive.

3. Finally, by the end of the 3rd century A. D., the meaning of the gerundive with the instant sense really develops, and the inaccurate use of the term preserved to our age can be traced back here through the late grammarians. At this time passive infinitive instant is also formed already with gerundive, e.g.: *A Sura comperit adoptandum se a Traiano esse* (Spartian. Hadr. 3, 10) «that Trajan will adopt him» and it is used also in the sense of passive participle instant, e.g.: *Hannibal cum tradendus esset, venenum bibit* (Eutrop. 4, 5) («because it was so that he will be delivered to the Romans»). Therefore we see later on already remarks like «*amandus*: ὁ φιληθροσόμενος καὶ ὁ φιλητέος (Prisc. Gramm. 2, 567, 7).

IV. After these we can survey the use of the cases of gerundive in accordance with points 1) and 2) of the above classification. Points 1) b) α) and β) and 2) a) α) and β) jointly give the use of the five cases of gerundive, as summed up briefly below:

Nom. Acc. Praep. Gen. Dat. Abl.
+ acc.

1) Gerundive having imperfect sense, and no sense of «necessitas», as an attribute:

a) as a usual attribute, which has no gerundial equivalent, and can be formed only from a few verbs (*oriundus* etc.):

→ → → → → →

b) as attribute of type «*in medio foro*», which can be formed only from transitive verbs and *utor* etc.:

α) its equivalent can be a gerundial construction with the same case:

→ → → →

β) it has no gerundial equivalent, after *curo*:

→

2) Gerundive having imperfect sense, and sense of «necessitas»:

a) as adverbial modifier of state:

α) its equivalent is only a gerundial construction with *ad* + acc. after verbs *do* etc., it can be formed only from transitive verbs and from *utor* etc.:

(→) →

β) it has no gerundival equivalent, it occurs after verb *sum*, it can be formed with an impersonal construction and also from intransitive verbs:

→ (→)

b) as attribute having no gerundial equivalent, particularly verbs of affect:

→ → → → → →

V. Finally we can remark that the gerundive can be called with full justice a participle. It is true that, besides the Italic languages, in the other Indo-European languages there is no participle with similar suffix, but, on the other hand, the gerundive fits so much into the Latin verbal system that it is formed from the imperfect stem. (But Greek adjective formed from verbs with the ending -τέος³ and having the sense of necessity, because this suffix is added directly to the verbal stem, naturally

bears only the name *adiectivum verbale*.) Thus the gerundive, as regards its formation, fits better into the Latin verbal system than the Latin so called *participium perfectum passivi*, which is formed from the verbal stem and not from some perfect stem (just as in other Indo-European languages; and thus its Greek equivalent with the ending $-\tauός^3$, which as regards its meaning is also both passive and perfective, as morphologically it does not fit either into the Greek *perfecta actio* or among the passive participles, similarly gets only the name *adiectivum verbale*).